

5

REMARKS

The present application was filed on June 2, 2005 with claims 1 through 26. Claims 1 through 26 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 17 and 26 are proposed to be amended herein.

In the Office Action, the Examiner maintained a rejection of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rogers (United States Patent Number 5,946,386). Regarding claims 1, 17, and 26, the Examiner asserts that Rogers teaches a method, apparatus and article of manufacture (101, Fig. 1) for providing a notification of an event, comprising a processor (201, Fig. 2) and memory, operative to receive a communication (111/118, Fig. 1 and col. 26, lines 47-64) and in response to said communication: determining an originating endpoint address on a network associated with said communication (Fig. 1 and col. 36, lines 33-45 and 56-62); identifying one or more designated persons associated with said originating endpoint address associated with said communication, wherein at least one of said designated persons is not a sender of said communication (Fig. 1 and col. 26, line 47, to col. 47, line 15); generating a notification message; and sending said notification message to said one or more designated persons (Fig. 1 and col. 26, lines 56-64 and col. 38, lines 4-5).

Generally, Rogers is directed to a system for “VIP handling” for special callers and customers. See, Col. 36, line 33. The VIP rules allow each user (i.e., the called party) to tailor how calls are handled and routed, for example, for “follow me” routing in which an important caller, or group of callers can be assigned a rule specifying that: “when you are out of the office, to call automatically to your cellular car or other phone.” Id. at lines 35-40. In addition, Rogers discloses a “find me” feature whereby several numbers are automatically dialed for a given user (called party) to find the called party for direct connection to the caller.

Each independent claim has been amended to emphasize that one or more designated persons are identified that have been previously designated for the *originating endpoint address*, wherein at least one of said designated persons is **not** the *sender or intended recipient* of the communication. A previous amendment, in response to the June 2, 2005 Office Action, amended the claims to emphasize the phrase “designated *third* persons.” In the subsequent Office Action, dated February 22, 2006, the Examiner objected to the use of the term “third” in this phrase. Applicants subsequently amended the claims to emphasize that at least one of the designated persons is not a

5 *sender* of the communication. (citing Fig. 3 and the corresponding discussion as support). Clearly, neither the sender or recipient of a communication are “third persons” to a communication

10 In order to remove any potential ambiguity, and also to more clearly distinguish over Rogers, Applicants have hereby amended the independent claims to emphasize that one or more designated persons are identified that have been previously designated for “*said originating endpoint address*,” wherein at least one of said designated persons is “not a *sender* of said communication and is not said *intended recipient*.”

15 In Rogers, the “follow me” and “find me” rules are clearly stored for the user (i.e., the *called party*) See, Col. 36, lines 33-45. Thus, Rogers does not disclose or suggest one or more designated persons are identified that have been *previously designated for* “*said originating endpoint address*.” Rather, in Rogers, the designated persons are identified for the terminating endpoint address (i.e., the *called party*).

20 In addition, since the “follow me” and “find me” rules are for the *called party*, the at least one designated person does not satisfy the amended claim limitation “is not a *sender* of said communication and is not said *intended recipient*.” Rather, in Rogers, the at least one designated person is the *calling party* or parties that have been designated as special callers and customers for the called party (the user). Thus, Rogers does not disclose or suggest that “at least one of said designated persons is not a *sender* of said communication and is not said *intended recipient*.”

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection.

Dependent Claims 2-16 and 18-25

25 Dependent claims 2-16 and 18-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rogers. Claims 2-16 and 18-25 are dependent on claims 1 and 17, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Rogers because of their dependency from amended independent claims 1, 17, and 26 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

30 If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below

5 The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin M. Mason

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

Date: May 27, 2008

10

15